



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,001	06/28/2005	Ludwig J Weimann	ULT1.LU-25	9034
3775	7590	06/16/2009	EXAMINER	
ELMAN TECHNOLOGY LAW, P.C. P. O. BOX 209 SWARTHMORE, PA 19081			FERNANDEZ, SUSAN EMILY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,001	WEIMANN, LUDWIG J	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14, 52-54 and 57-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 52-54 and 57-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 57-62 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed January 29, 2009, has been received and entered.

Claims 15-51, 55, and 56 are canceled. Claims 1-14, 52-54, and 57-62 are pending and examined on the merits.

Claim Objections

Claims 57-62 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 57 recites “of the” twice in line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-13, 52, 53, and 57-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitragotri et al. (US 5,814,599, listed on 6/28/05 IDS) in view of Royds et al. (US 5,466,465, listed on 6/28/05 IDS), and Unger et al. (US 5,580,575, listed on 6/28/05 IDS).

Mitragotri et al. discloses “a method for enhancing delivery of a drug across the skin comprising applying the drug encapsulated in a liposome or polymeric microparticle to the skin in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier...and applying ultrasound at a frequency of between 20 kHz and less than 10 MHz at an intensity not causing any irreversible skin damage for a period

of time effective to deliver the drug encapsulated in the liposome or microparticle across the skin in a desired drug dosage" (claim 1). It is noted that the ultrasound frequency meets the limitation of ultrasound frequency recited in instant claims 6 and 52.

Mitragotri et al. differs from the claimed invention in that it does not expressly disclose that the medium for holding the microparticles is placed on a surface of a patch adjacent to the skin.

Royds et al. teaches a transdermal drug delivery system (abstract), hence a patch. Figure 1 presents in detail a transdermal patch (column 4, lines 30-32). The patch contains a matrix 20 carrying microencapsulated particles of the drug to be delivered (column 4, lines 56-65) and an adhesive layer 16 (column 4, lines 45-48). In the operation of the drug delivery system, the drug leaches from the particles into the matrix 20 for subsequent passage through the skin of the user (column 5, lines 10-12). As the matrix is formulated to absorb several times its own weight in water given the compounds present in the matrix (column 4, lines 56-61), the matrix holding the microcapsules include skin permeation enhancers (as they would foster hydration of the skin area, fostering release and adsorption of the drug, see column 4, lines 53-55).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to have placed the medium for holding the microparticles of the Mitragotri invention on a surface of a patch adjacent to the skin when practicing the Mitragotri invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Royds et al. demonstrates that the contents of microencapsulated particles can be delivered from a patch for transdermal drug delivery. It would have been obvious to have included skin permeation

enhancers in the medium for holding the microparticles of the Mitragotri invention since Royds et al. teaches that they are suitable for inclusion in a transdermal drug delivery system.

Mitragotri et al. also differs from the claimed invention in that it does not teach that the ultrasonic energy applied is at a resonant frequency for certain or all the microparticles.

Unger et al. discloses a drug delivery system involving microspheres comprising a therapeutic drug (abstract). The microspheres are ruptured at the peak resonant frequency using ultrasound (column 17, lines 62-64), wherein the peak resonant frequency will vary depending on the diameter, elasticity, and flexibility of the microspheres (column 18, lines 12-15).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious the person of ordinary skill in the art to have used ultrasound at a resonant frequency for certain or all of the microparticles to rupture them when practicing the Mitragotri invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since microsphere rupture is due to peak resonant frequency, as demonstrated in Unger et al. Therefore, this would allow for selective drug delivery from different sized microparticles. Claim 7 is rendered obvious because it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to have included multiple drugs in a single patch in order to treat a variety of symptoms. As the microparticle diameter affects the peak resonant frequency, different microparticles containing different drugs can be selected for release. A variety of microparticle diameters can be used, thus rendering obvious the diameter recited in instant claim 5.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to have included different drugs in the microcapsules, including those recited in claims 8-12 and 58-62, as it would have achieved the predictable result of drug delivery. Furthermore, as noted in the

response filed on May 6, 2008, no one specific substance or agent for drug delivery is critical for the operation of the claimed invention. Thus, claims 8-12 and 58-62 are rendered obvious.

A holding of obviousness is clearly required.

Claims 1-14, 52, 53, and 57-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitragotri et al., Royds et al., and Unger et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-13, 52, 53, and 57-62 above, and further in view of Zeimer et al. (US 4,891,043).

As discussed above, Mitragotri et al., Royds et al., and Unger et al. render claims 1, 3-13, 52, 53, and 57-62 obvious. However, they do not expressly disclose that thermal energy is applied to the patch to release the encapsulated drug from the microparticles.

Zeimer et al. teaches a system for selectively releasing materials, such as drugs, at a specific site in the body of an animal (abstract). Lipid vesicles containing the drug are irradiated by a laser beam, thereby heating the lipid vesicles and causing them to rupture (column 4, lines 38-40).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to have controlled the release of the drugs from the microcapsules in the patch disclosed in Royds et al. by the application of thermal energy (laser beam) to the microcapsules. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since it would have allowed for the control of drug release, increasing the selectivity of drug release. Thus, claims 2, 14, and 54 are rendered obvious.

A holding of obviousness is clearly required.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 29, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Mitragotri et al. is now used as the primary reference, thus teaching transdermal drug release by the application of ultrasound. Therefore, the applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ whose telephone number is (571)272-3444. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

Susan E. Fernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 1651

sef